

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, and 5-12 are amended herein. Claims 15 and 16 are new.

Applicants again respectfully again reminds the Examiner that, in accordance with an agreement between Applicants and the Examiner reiterated in the Applicants' Supplemental Amendment dated December 31, 2003, Applicants submitted in that Amendment copies of six previously filed information disclosures, which, according to the Examiner were missing from the file. Applicants requested in the Supplemental Amendment dated December 31, 2003 that the Examiner verify that the art in those information disclosures has been considered by the Examiner, and send to the Applicants signed 1449 forms so indicating. The Examiner has returned but one of the six information disclosures for which copies were again submitted.

In accordance with the above remarks, Applicants cannot identify that five signed and initialed information disclosure forms have been returned as identified below. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide the signed and initialed information disclosure forms as indicated and as originally submitted, copies of which were submitted again with the Supplemental Amendment dated December 31, 2003.

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated March 11, 2002;

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated May 3, 2002;

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated May 10, 2002;

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated May 16, 2002; and

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated June 17, 2002.

Applicants also note that the Examiner has not indicated approval of an amended drawing earlier submitted on January 8, 2002. Approval of the drawing changes is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has also not indicated approval of formal drawings, also filed on January 8, 2002 and having the amendments. Approval of the formal drawings is respectfully requested.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Gustafson in View of Hsu et al.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gustafson (US patent number 6,014,601) in view of Hsu et al. (US patent number 6,297,732). The Examiner asserts that Gustafson discloses the claimed radar transceiver attached to a vehicle. The Examiner recognizes that Gustafson does not specifically disclose that the transceiver is portably attached to the vehicle. The Examiner relies upon Hsu et al. as teaching a radar/laser detector, part of which may be mounted to any convenient location in the vehicle. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art "...to incorporate the well known teaching of using self contained housings that communicate with each other wirelessly that allows portability, as disclosed by Hsu et al., with the system of Gustafson, to provide the mounting to any vehicle."

Applicants have amended Claim 1 herein to require "...a side object detection radar transceiver portably attached to a vehicle." Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 14 to 28, and in FIG. 4.

Applicants submit that amended Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Gustafson, whether taken alone or in combination with Hsu et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "...a side object detection radar transceiver portably attached to a vehicle," as set forth in Claim 1.

With this particular arrangement, the claimed radar system is able to detect objects to the side of a vehicle on which the system is mounted. For example, the system can detect another vehicle in the blind spot of the vehicle on which the system is mounted. To this end, the claimed radar system can, in one embodiment, generate detection zones to the side of a vehicle as illustrated in FIG. 4. The claimed side object detection radar transceiver is portably attached to

the vehicle, allowing a user to easily install the radar system on a vehicle and to move the radar system from vehicle to vehicle.

It should be noted that Gustafson teaches the possibility of the device being an after market product, meaning that the Gustafson device is installed after manufacture of a vehicle. Gustafson, does not describe or suggest a portable device.

Furthermore, in contrast, Applicants submit that Gustafson merely provides a driver alert system having a laser transmitter and receiver, or alternatively a radar transmitter and receiver, for transmitting and receiving in a direction forward of a vehicle upon which the system is mounted. As described by Gustafson at column 1, lines 5-8, the present invention provides "...a detector for use in a vehicle for measuring the relative speed and distance of objects in the path of travel of the vehicle." Therefore, Gustafson does not teach the claimed side object detection radar transceiver.

Hsu et al. discloses a radar/laser detection device "...adapted to detect radar signals, laser signals, or both." (column 3, lines 45-46) The Examiner relies upon Hsu et al. to teach portability to provide easy mounting to any vehicle. However, Applicants submit that Hsu et al. teaches away from the claimed *side object detection radar transceiver portably attached to a vehicle*. For example, Hsu et al. describes at column 4, line 38-40, that "[v]ehicle 9 may have existing sensor systems such as the blind spot system 19 already installed before enhancement with the apparatus of the present invention." Therefore, Applicants submit that the blind spot system 19 of Hsu et al. is fixed to the vehicle and Hsu et al. teaches away from the claimed side object detection system portably mounted to the vehicle.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Gustafson, whether taken alone or in combination with Hsu et al..

Claims 2-3, 6-8, 10, and 11 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 2-3, 6-8, 10, and 11 are patentably distinct over the cited references generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

The Examiner asserts, in reference to Claim 11, that Gustafson discloses the claimed radar transceiver is portably attached to the interior of a vehicle. As described above, Applicants submit that Gustafson teaches the possibility of the device being an after market product, meaning that the Gustafson device is installed after manufacture of a vehicle. Gustafson, does not describe or suggest a portable device.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that the Examiner may have misread Claim 11, which requires that the radar transceiver is portably attached to the exterior of the vehicle. Thus, Applicants submit that Claim 11 is further patentably distinct over Gustafson, whether taken alone or in combination with Hsu et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "... the side object detection radar transceiver is portably attached to the exterior of the vehicle so as to be visible to an occupant of the vehicle," as required by Claim 11.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10, and 11 are patentably distinct over Gustafson, whether taken alone or in combination with Hsu et al.

#### Gustafson in View of Hsu et al. and Bell

The Examiner rejects Claims 4, 5, 9, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gustafson in view of Hsu et al. and further in view of Bell et al. (US patent number 6,232,910). The Examiner asserts that in Gustafson, a panel 14 may be positioned on a face of a housing. The Examiner recognizes that Gustafson does not specifically disclose a radar display portably attached to the exterior of a vehicle. The Examiner relies upon Hsu et al. as teaching that a detector, including the display module 29, may also communicate with other sensors remotely via RF. The Examiner also relies upon Bell et al. as teaching a plurality of displays, provided in areas of the vehicle where the driver can see them, including displays on the exterior of the vehicle. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art "...to incorporate the teaching of placing the display on the exterior of the vehicle, or on any window of the vehicle, as disclosed by Bell, with the combination of Gustafson and Hsu et al., so that the driver as well as other motorists can easily determine that the main vehicle has detected nearby person's or it's vehicle."

For substantially the same reasons described above in conjunction with Claim 1, Applicants submit that amended Claims 4, 5, 9, and 12-14 are patentably distinct over Gustafson, whether taken alone or in combination with Hsu et al. and Bell et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "a side object detection radar transceiver portably attached to a vehicle," as required by Claims 4, 5, 9, and 12-14.

Gustafson and Hsu et al. are discussed above. Applicants submit that Bell et al. fails to overcome the above deficiencies in Gustafson and Hsu et al. Bell et al. describes a vehicle radar system having radar sensors 202, 204 and 206 each comprising a radar transmitter and receiver circuit. Bell et al. describes at column 9, lines 1-18 that the radar sensors can be placed at selected fixed locations about a vehicle. Therefore, Applicants submit that Bell et al. also neither describes nor suggests the claimed side object detection radar transceivers portably attached to the vehicle.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be removed.

Applicants have amended Claims 2, and 5-12 herein without prejudice, merely to improve antecedent basis in respect of amended Claim 1 and to add clarity.

Claims 15 and 16 are new in the application. Claims 15 and 16 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 15 and 16 are allowable over the cited references of record in this case generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

Applicants submit that new Claim 15 is further patentably distinct over the reference of record in the case, since the references of record neither describe nor suggest "... wherein the side object detection radar transceiver is adapted to provide a predetermined detection zone to the side of a vehicle, for which objects outside of the predetermined detection zone are not detected," as set forth in Claim 15. Support for new Claim 15 can be found in FIG. 4.

Applicants submit that new Claim 16 is further patentably distinct over the reference of record in the case, since the references of record neither describe nor suggest "...the predetermined detection zone to the side of the vehicle is associated with a vehicle blind spot," as set forth in Claim 16. Support for new Claim 16 can be found in FIG. 4.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that Claims 1-16 and the entire case are in condition for allowance and should be sent to issue and such action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 14, 2004

DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP

By: Kermit Robinson  
Kermit Robinson  
Reg. No. 48,734  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
275 Turnpike Street, Suite 101  
Canton, MA 02021-2354  
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, ext. 24  
Fax: (781) 401-9966

Attachments: none